



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.												
09/911,819	07/24/2001	John T. Micco	04899-046001	6291												
7590 Kevin J. Canning, Esq. Lahive & Cockfield, LL.P 28 State Street Boston, MA 02109		07/13/2007	<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">VU, TUAN A</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>2193</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>07/13/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		VU, TUAN A		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2193		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	07/13/2007	PAPER
EXAMINER																
VU, TUAN A																
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER															
2193																
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE															
07/13/2007	PAPER															

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/911,819	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MICCO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tuan A. Vu	<b>Art Unit</b> 2193	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A. Vu.

(3) Nesli Doran.

(2) Kevin Canning.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 09 July 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Shannon.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's representative gave a brief view on what the invention can do in order to provide an optimized way to translate a first language to another language; and also inquired on how the Examiner characterized Shannon as being equivalent to the claimed matter of claim 1. The examiner had explained the breadth in meaning conveyed by some key terms in the claim (so broad of terms); and this was not sufficient to put forth how the translation from one language to another language (e.g. as specified in the Disclosure) to enable the claims to be given the weight that would distinguish the invention from translation of code seen in known practices -- e.g. practice as to use a description/definition file as well as interactive type of language to support similar code translation endeavor. An example is that a description file should be recited with implementation specifics to overcome the likes of IDL, and such that using the specifics inside this definition file would alleviate otherwise the need to consult the construction definition of each of the 2 languages involved in the translation (and so, with the understanding that the particular nature of object to be translated, e.g. a function, would be but a mere obvious variation, not a novelty). The Examiner's suggestions were recommended to the effect to instill one or more novel facets of the invention that go beyond claiming having a definition file and translating. Also suggested was that the claim should convey a statutory outcome in terms of application result being achieved or reasonably indicative of being realized..